

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 HELLER EHRLMAN LLP, No. C 14-01239 CRB
10 Plaintiff, **ORDER AWARDING COSTS**
11 v.
12 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE
13 LLP, Defendant.

15 After the Court granted summary judgment, Defendant filed, pursuant to Federal Rule
16 of Civil Procedure 54(d), a Bill of Costs (dkt. 24) seeking a total of \$48,148.90. Now before
17 the Court are Plaintiff's objections (dkt. 27) to the Bill of Costs. Under Rule 54(d), there is a
18 presumption that the prevailing party will be awarded its taxable costs. See Save Our Valley
19 v. Sound Transit, 335 F.3d 932, 944 (9th Cir. 2003). To overcome this presumption, a losing
20 party must establish a reason to deny costs. See Stanley v. Univ. of S. Cal., 178 F.3d 1069,
21 1079 (9th Cir. 1999). Here, Plaintiff has specifically identified "extras" which are for
22 convenience of the lawyers and not properly billable to Plaintiff in the amount of \$13,918.62.
23 Plaintiff's other objections are OVERRULED. Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to pay a
24 total of \$34,230.28 in taxable costs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

28 || Dated: July 25, 2014

CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

